UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/591,672	10/27/2006	Konrad Engelhardt	095309.58135US	095309.58135US 3120	
23911 7590 12/12/2007 CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			EXAMINER		
			HELLNER, MARK		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			3663		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/591,672	ENGELHARDT ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mark Hellner	3663			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This  3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4)	vn from consideration.  r election requirement.  r.  epted or b) □ objected to by the E				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	anning. Note the allagrica childs	, (4.6)			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

10/591,672 Art Unit: 3663

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yabe (5,323,872) in view of DE 40 31 552 (reference AH on PTO form 1449).

Yabe discloses a safety device for a motor vehicle, the device comprising: at least one closable opening of the interior (6); a servo driver (5) either opening or closing the opening to the interior; and a control unit (1) that is configured to evaluate safety-related data when the vehicle is in motion to activate the servo drive to produced an open gap in the closable opening prior to the occurrence of an anticipated accident.

The difference between claim 1 and Yabe is the function of moving from an open position to the open gap rather than from the disclosed closed position.

DE 40 31 552 teaches the concept of moving an open vehicle panel to a closed position upon indication of an impending accident in order to protect occupants form debris.

It would have been obvious to have combined this control function with the function of Yabe in order provide a device that yields safe results for all opening levels of the window.

Claim 11 reads on the function disclosed by Yabe.

10/591,672 Art Unit: 3663

Claim 12 is taught by the logic elements that are a part of the control unit.

Claim 13 is taught by element 6 of Yabe.

A quick response (claim 14) is taught by either Yabe or DE 40 31 552 in that they both respond at accident speed.

Claims 15 – 17 are taught by the collision sensor (3) of Yabe.

Claim 18 is taught by DE 40 31 552.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

Mark Heliner

**Primary Examiner** 

AU 3663